DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 774 CS 503 288

AUTHOR Spitzberg, Brian H.
TITLE Loneliness and Communication Apprehension.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 35p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (San Jose, CA, February 14-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Anxiety; Attribution Theory; *Communication Research; *Communication Skills; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Competence; *Loneliness; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Apprehension

ABSTRACT

Calling upon attribution theory, a study was conducted to determine whether chronically lonely individuals would manifest significantly more communication apprehension (CA) than would situationally lonely individuals. The UCLA loneliness scale (LS) and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) were administered to 170 college students. Two versions of the LS were used, one instructing the students to refer to their last two weeks of experience and the other referring to most of their lifetime. The operational definition of situational loneliness consisted of scores falling more than one standard deviation above the mean on the two-week scale and less than the mean on the lifetime scale. Chronic loneliness was operationalized as scores that were more than one standard deviation above the means for both scales. Using these criteria, 10 situationally lonely and 9 chronically lonely students were chosen for analysis. This analysis revealed that chronically lonely persons rated significantly higher than situationally lonely persons in CA. The results were interpreted as supporting an attributional model of loneliness and as providing important considerations for the therapeutic intervention involved in the treatment of both CA and loneliness. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199774

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

LONELINESS AND COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

ABSTRACT

Relying upon attribution theory, it was hypothesized that chronically lonely individuals would manifest significantly more communication apprehension (CA) than situationally lonely individuals. The UCLA loneliness scale and McCroskey's PRCA-College scale were administered to 170 college students. The operational definitions of chronic and situational conditions selected 9 and 10 individuals respectively. As hypothesized, analysis revealed that chronically lonely individuals rated significantly higher than situationally lonely persons in communication apprehension ($t(17) = 3.158$, p .01). Results were interpreted as supporting an attributional model of loneliness, and as providing important considerations for the therapeutic intervention involved in the treatment of both CA and loneliness.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Brian H. Spitzberg
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Brian H. Spitzberg

Communication Arts & Sciences

University of Southern California

Los Angeles, Ca. 90007

Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Jose, Ca.; February 1981.

CS503288

Thirty years ago, Reiman, Glazer and Denny (1950) characterized the American society as a "lonely crowd." In 1970, Philip Slater depicted The Pursuit of Loneliness intrinsic to our culture. These provocative accounts concern the broad conflicts between individual and societal pressures that lead to anomie and frustration. Loneliness has since been isolated as a more specified and distinct psychological state. Still, based upon the most recent national evidence, Rubin (1979) comments that "within any period of several weeks, more than a quarter of all American adults feel painfully lonely" (p. 85). The painful nature of loneliness was depicted poignantly by a "lonely and unwanted" man, who in 1980, vowed to randomly murdur innocent persons because he was "depressed, frustrated and lonely" (UPI, January 2, 1980). If loneliness is indeed as pervasive and potent as these accounts indicate, it is important to investigate and understand its origins and effects.

Loneliness has been linked strongly to such problems as low self-esteem, anxiety, shyness, difficulty in communicating, limited social skills, depression, alcoholism, and even suicide (Beck & Young, 1979; Bragg, 1979; Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Loucks, 1974; Lynch, 1977; Moore, 1974, 1976; Moore & Sermat, 1974; Nerviano & Gross, 1976, Rubenstein, Peplau & Shaver, 1979). Less clear, however, are the causal and contributing factors that lead to and nuture the experience of loneliness. Theoretical and empirical investigation of loneliness is still in its infancy, and as a result, there is only limited consensus regarding the causes of loneliness (Perlman & Peplau, 1979, p. 2). So it is especially important to discover the "mechanisms which perpetuate

and maintain lonely states and feelings and inhibit the restoration of satisfying interpersonal relationships" (Jones, Freeman & Coswick, 1978, p. 2). It may be that the experience of loneliness itself may result in affective, cognitive and behavioral changes that in turn, entrench or perpetuate loneliness. The study reported here addresses this issue.

Loneliness is a state of dissatisfaction with achieved versus desired relational intimacy. And it is increasingly apparent that intimacy is engendered and maintained by the processes of interpersonal communication (Berger & Calabrese, 1977; Knapp, 1978; Millar & Rogers, 1976; Miller & Steinberg, 1975). Factors that inhibit communication, and the development of intimacy, are thus suspect as important variables in the etiology and duration of loneliness. One such inhibiting factor that has received considerable attention in recent years is the construct of communication apprehension (CA). Research has repeatedly demonstrated that communication apprehension is a significant problem. It is now known that "unacceptably high levels of CA are experienced by about 20% of the children in our schools and the adults in our society. It is vital that we learn more about why this is true and what we can do to eliminate what is clearly the most pervasive communication problem of comtemporary society" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 93). One way of approaching the problem of communication apprehension is through the construct of loneliness and its experiential correlates. Therefore, prior to elaborating the study, I will 1) review the literature regarding communication apprehension, 2) review the literature concerning loneliness, 3) recast both of these

constructs within an attributional framework, and 4) specify the predicted impact of attributional processes on the experience of loneliness and the onset of communication apprehension.

RATIONALE

Communication Apprehension

The construct of communication apprehension has developed from the fragmented areas of stage fright, speech pathology and personality theory (Phillips, 1968). The related concepts of reticence and CA have been active concerns of communication "scholars over the past fifty years" (Daly, 1978). Only recently however, has systematic conceptualization and experimentation begun to clarify the construct. "CA is defined as an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 78). Persons with high CA will frequently avoid communicative interaction in order to avert the experience of anxiety s/he associates with communication.

Communication apprehension is conceived of as a trait (i.e., a relatively stable and enduring individual disposition) that develops primarily because of a person's socialization history. Put simply, "If a child is reinforced for being silent and is not reinforced for communicating, the probable result is a quiet child" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 80). The family and poor networks during adolescence, and the educational system, interact in various ways to reinforce silence and punish communicative interaction and assertiveness. Although CA is usually conceptualized as a trait, some evidence exists to indicate that it

has situation-specific qualities and context-specific effects similar to a state experience (Beatty, Behnke & McCallum, 1978; Jordon & Powers, 1978; Porter, 1979; Powers & Hutchinson, 1979). However, these studies can be interpreted as indicating individual trait-like proclivities to react to situations and contexts in certain characteristic ways (Argyle & Little, 1972; Endler, Hunt & Rosenstein, 1962; Freeman, 1953; Lazzerini, Cox & Mackay, 1979; McReynolds, 1968; Spielberger, 1966; Svanum & Beaman, 1974). It seems then, that CA may result from adolescent socialization and/or extended exposure to threatening situations. These divergent etiologies may portend different conceptual interpretations of empirical results.

Several personality and behavioral correlates of CA have been empirically identified. Burgoon (1976) identifies communication apprehension as those who feel insecure, communicatively inadequate, shy and withdrawn (p. 62). McCroskey (1977) considers CA to be largely isomorphic with shyness. McCroskey, Daly and Sorenson (1976) found communication apprehension "to be positively correlated with anxiety, dogmatism, and external control, but negatively correlated with . . . dominance, surgency, character, adventurousness, confidence, self-control, tolerance for ambiguity, and need to achieve" (pp. 377-78). Similarly, Rosenfeld and Plax (1976) found that reticent individuals scored low on dominance, social self, nurturance and affiliation, all of which indicate interpersonal ineffectiveness and social withdrawal. According to these investigations, the communication apprehensive is basically an introverted, maladaptive and unassertive individual. Behavioral studies of shyness and

social anxiety have also found that anxious individuals are socially unskilled and incompetent (Daly, 1978; Pilkonis, 1977a, 1977b).

The apprehensive then, communicates relatively ineffectively and infrequently. The evidence to date indicates that this proclivity to be shy and withdrawn results in negative perceptions of communication apprehensives by others (McCroskey, Richmond, Daly & Cox, 1975; McCroskey, Daly, Richmond & Falcione, 1977). These studies have indicated that apprehensives are seen as socially unattractive. It is not surprising therefore, that McCroskey and Sheahan "found that although there was no difference between students of high and low CA in terms of the number of dates they desired over a 14-day period, . . . the students with low CA reported having almost twice as many dates during the preceeding 14-day periord as the students with high CA" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 90). This is significant because it describes a discrepancy between levels of desired and achieved interpersonal intimacy.

The tendency of apprehensives to withdraw from interaction coupled with their perceived unattractiveness puts them at risk for the experience of anomia (Burgoon, 1976). Anomia, as a form of interpersonal isolation, has in turn been associated with impaired communication skills and tendencies (Parks, 1977). Clearly, the literature portrays the communication apprehensive as both intentionally withdrawn from, and isolated by, social networks. The apprehensive lacks the communicative confidence and/or skills to either initiate or maintain intimate relationships in a consistently satisfying manner. It seems reasonable

to conclude that the person with high CA experiences a "severly debilitating, personality-type characteristic" (McCroskey, Daly & Sorenson, 1976, p. 380). One of the debilitating aspects of CA could be expected to be the experience of loneliness.

Loneliness

Loneliness has for a long time been dealt with under the guise of related, yet distinct, aspects of human experience (Fromm-Reichmann, 1959). Recently however, considerable progress has been made in developing a functional definition of loneliness. "There seems to be a general agreement among different investigators that loneliness is a function of an unfavorable discrepancy between the interpersonal relationships the individual perceives himself as having at the time, and the kinds of relationships he would like to have" (Sermat, 1979, p. 1). In such definitions, "loneliness reflects the relationship between two factors, the desired and achieved level of social interaction" (Perlman & Peplau, 1979, p. 3). This conceptualization is global in nature. That is, it attempts to tap a general or overall perception of a person's affective or cognitive state of loneliness. The state of loneliness is one in which the level of achieved relational interaction and intimacy is unsatisfactory (Mijuskovic, 1977; Spengler, 1976).

The dissatisfied nature of loneliness makes it a consistently unpleasant feeling of negative affect (Perlman & Pelau, 1979; Russell, Peplau & Ferguson, 1978; Weiss, 1973). Loneliness can thus be distinguished from the normal conceptualization of isolation. Research demonstrates that loneliness and isolation are distinct phenomena (Fischer & Phillips 1979; Moustakas, 1972).

Apparently, many people can, and often do, choose to be alone. For these people in these situations, isolation is a desirable condition.

The causes of loneliness are complex and not well understood at present. Some theorists argue that a susceptibility to loneliness is often developed through a socialization history that impairs social skills or disturbs the adolescent's early life (Hartog, 1979; Paloutzian & Ellison, 1979; Shaver & Rubenstein, 1979; the author, 1980). Other factors that may predispose the experience of loneliness include "shyness, low social risk-taking, lack of assertiveness, self-consciousness in social situations" (Peplau & Perlman, 1979, p. 7), low self-esteem (Jones, 1978; Loucks, 1974; Rubenstein, Shaver & Peplau, 1979; Smith, 1968), and most importantly for this analysis, social anxiety (Bragg, 1979; Fromm-Reichmann, 1959; Hones, Freemon & Goswick, 1978; Loucks, 1974; Peplau & Perlman, 1979; Sermat, 1979; Wood, 1979). This is significant because it indicates that the experience of loneliness is closely associated with the experience of anxiety. There is also a considerable body of literature relating forms of anxiety with interpersonal problems such as minimal dating (Barlow, Abel, Blanchard, Bristow & Young, 1977; Bellack & Hersen, 1978; Clark & Arkowitz, 1975; Arkowitz, 1977; Watson & Friend, 1969). These studies have indicated that social and dating anxiety affect one's ability to achieve a satisfactory level of intimacy and interaction.

One aspect of anxiety that has been found consistently in investigations of loneliness is that of egocentrism and inhibited sociability (Gerson & Perlman, 1979; Horowitz & French, 1979;

Sadler, 1975). In communicative interaction, the typical lonely individual has been "characterized as self-focused and non-responsive as well as perhaps superficial and emotionally dissatisfying" (Jones, 1978, p. 3). This type of interaction has elsewhere been found to be negatively related to one's heterosocial attractiveness (Kupke, Calhoun & Hobbes, 1979; Kupke, Hobbes & Cheney, 1979). Again, as in CA, there seems to be a tendency in loneliness to isolate oneself even during interaction, and possibly, to be isolated by others.

An Attributional Analysis

At this point, I consider it important to examine some of the congruent areas between the CA and loneliness constructs. CA is an anxiety experienced in response to a perceived speaking situation. Loneliness is often accompanied by feelings of anxiety. Apparently, CA is associated with social withdrawal and diminished social attractivess. Similarly, loneliness is seen as accompanying, and possibly resulting in, social withdrawal. Lonely persons at least perceive themselves as socially unattractive (Jones, et al., 1978; Russell, et al., 1978) and may actually be perceived as less attractive than nonlonely persons. Clearly, the literature suggests that lonely individuals are likely to also have communication apprehension. The problem that remains then, is to delineate specifically what kind of impact loneliness can be expected to have on communication apprehension.

Loneliness has been increasingly interpreted within the framework of attribution theory, and this theoretic position offers a reasonable explanation of the likely relationship

between CA and loneliness. Rubenstein, Shaver and Peplau (1979) have identified three attributional dimensions:

> Locus of causality ("Am I to blame for my loneliness, or is it something in my environment?"); stability over time ("Is my loneliness transitory, or is it likely to be permanent?"); and controllability ("Is there anything I can do about being lonely, or is it out of my hands?") (p. 63).

These types of attributions can help to resolve a theoretical paradox about loneliness. Some people are aroused by loneliness to constantly seek out interpersonal relationships (Sullivan, 1953; Weiss, 1973), whereas the motivations of others are suppressed (Fromm-Reichmann, 1959; Jones, 1978; Sermat, 1979). Several theorists have explicitly or implicitly used attribution theory in their interpretations of loneliness research (Russell, Peplau & Heim, 1979).

According to attribution theory, persons who attribute their loneliness to stable character traits (e.g., "I'm ugly," or "I'm no good at talking to others") are more prone to experience depression, which in turn diminishes their motivation to interact with others. Because they see their situation as hopeless and unlikely to change, they accept it as a burden they have to bear. They withdraw because being active cannot change things (Beck & Young, 1978; Paloutzian & Ellison, 1979; Shaver & Rubenstein, 1979). Significantly, Jones, et al. concluded from their study of communicative interactions

> that lonely individuals reflect and disparage both themselves and others. Consequently, lonely persons not only fail to initiate potential interpersonal relationships, but perhaps also actively avoid such involvements because, in their view, there is literally no one worth getting involved with, including oneself (p. 31).

The internality and stability of attributions of the subjects in this study were apparently very strong, and this may limit its generalization to all lonely persons. But this finding is important, in that, it depicts a pattern of oral communication avoidance, typical of communication apprehensives. It is also in accordance with much anxiety research. Cattell and Scheier (1958) concluded that it "seems best to consider whatever social withdrawal is associated with anxiety as a by-product of general lack of self-assurance or even disgust with self" (p. 372). Clark and Arkowitz (1975) found that in comparison to judge ratings, "high anxious subjects were more negative about their social skill than low anxious subjects" (p. 218). Similar findings were presented by Glasgow and Arkowitz (1975). Such research has led Pilkonis and Zimbardo (1979) to differentiate between the dispositionally and situational shy. That is, stable enduring shyness becomes internalized attributionally by the individual. Negative self attributions seem to mediate both the experience of loneliness and anxiety. This may in part explain the consistent relationships found among both CA (McCroskey, et al., 1977) and loneliness (Rubenstein, et al., 1979), and low self-esteem.

One attributional factor that becomes particularly relevant to the explanation of loneliness and its effects is stability. Long periods of loneliness tend to cause one to perceive more stable attributions of loneliness. This in turn should strengthen self-blame and self-effacement. An example of the impact of stable internal attributions is found in a study by Paloutzian and Ellison (1979). They found that those "with more positive

perceptions of their social skills were less likely to engage in sensual ($r(199) = -.23$) or diversionary ($r(197) = -.23$) responses, and were more likely to engage in religious ($r(199) = .17$) and intimacy oriented activities ($r(199) = .18$)" (p. 5). One interpretation of this finding is that lonely individuals who attribute their condition partly or wholly to their inadequate social skills (i.e., stable, internal, character traits) are less likely to engage in interactive coping behaviors (i.e. communicative interaction). This implies that when the causes of loneliness are attributed to stable internal traits, there is greater likelihood for the experience of communication apprehension. And according to the attributional interpretation of loneliness, stable internal attributions are more likely to occur if the loneliness has been endured for a long period of time (Peplau, Russell & Heim, 1979).

The distinction implied by this interpretation is between situational and chronic loneliness. Situational loneliness "involves individuals who had adequate relationships until they were confronted either with a specific crises such as death or divorce, or with a predictable developmental change like leaving home for college" (Young, 1979c, p. 2). Situational loneliness would be expected to exist when a person perceives an external locus of causality, unstable or transient duration and eventual controllability. "Chronic loneliness refers to people who have not been able to establish satisfying relationships for a period of several years, across at least two developmental stages" (Young, 1979c, p. 2). This loneliness could be expected to manifest perceptions of an internal locus

of causality, stable or relatively permanent duration and uncontrollability. According to attribution theory, the longer one experiences such attributions, the more chronic or internalized they become (see Kelley & Michela, 1980; Valle, 1974). And the more chronic the loneliness, the more likely the person is to experience communication apprehension.

Although the evidence is very sparse concerning the distinction between situational and chronic loneliness, the available research is very suggestive. Gerson and Perlman (1979) were interested in testing the distinction by investigating the communicative expressiveness of experimental subjects. Actual face-to-face interactions were not studied. But observers rated the expressiveness of videotaped subjects who were differentiated into non-, situationally, and chronically lonely groups. The hypothesis was that situationally lonely individuals would be more expressive than chronically lonely, due to their different attributions.

Presumably, the situationally lonely individuals would perceive higher controllability, lower stability and more external rather than internal control. The painful experiences of loneliness would thus act as a motivation to alter the situation. The situationally lonely individuals were expected to manifest more expressive communication as a result of their heightened state of motivation. The Gerson and Perlman (1979) study confirmed the author's expectations; "the situationally lonely subjects were more expressive by both measures. . ." (p. 259). Such expressiveness would be atypical for the reticent or apprehensive person (Phillips, 1968).

This study by Gerson and Perlman (1979) indicates that situationally lonely individuals experience "motivational arousal" (p. 258), and therefore, are likely to desire interactive opportunities. Chronically lonely persons, according to the attributional interpretation, will have concluded that interaction is either worthless or likely to subject them to unwanted social rejection. As Girodo (1978) elaborates, "shy people tend to blame themselves for their lack of success, . . . furthermore, when they are successful, they attribute their success to something other than themselves" (p. 49). On the basis of these theoretical speculations and empirical findings, the following hypothesis appears justified:

H: Chronically lonely individuals will manifest significantly greater communication apprehension than situationally lonely individuals.

An additional area of interest arises from the distinction between chronic and situational loneliness. In the Gerson and Perlman (1979) experiment, the situationally lonely subjects were more expressive than both the chronic and nonlonely subjects. Yet, there is insufficient basis for concluding or predicting that situationally lonely individuals will be lower in CA than nonlonely individuals. Since it is important to know which individuals may need therapeutic intervention the most, the following research question will be examined:

Q: Do situationally lonely individuals manifest significantly different amounts of communication apprehension than nonlonely persons?

METHOD

Participants

A pilot study was performed to investigate the sufficiency

of the induction for the scales. The study packets were distributed to 33 students in lower division basic speech courses at a large western university. Examination of these results revealed several identical and similar response patterns between the two loneliness scales. This outcome indicated that the instructions needed to be specified and emphasized. Upon subsequent modification of the instrument packet, it was administered along with the study packet of a colleague to 170 undergraduate students in speech courses at the university. Thirteen packets were rejected due to excessive unfilled responses. This left a total of 157 respondents for analysis. Demographic data indicated that the sample was approximately 60% female, and all classes were represented, with sophomores being the largest category.

Procedure

The instruments used were the UCLA Loneliness Scale (LS)[1] and McCroskey's Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA)-College.[2] Two versions of the LS were used, one instructing the subjects to refer to their last two weeks of experience in answering the items, the other referring to most of their lifetime. Both the LS (Ellison & Paloutzian, 1979; Russell, Peplau & Cutrona, 1978; Russell, Peplau & Ferguson, 1978) and the PRCA (McCroskey, 1978) have received consistently supportive reliability estimates in the past. In this study, all three scales achieved identical alpha coefficients of .91. These three scales together required approximately 10-15 minutes to complete for most participants (65 total items).

The operational definition of situational loneliness consisted of scores falling more than one standard deviation above

the mean on the 2-week scale (L_1), and less than the mean on the lifetime scale (L_2). Chronic loneliness was operationalized as those respondents who scored more than one standard deviation above the means for both L_1 and L_2. These criteria defined 10 situationally and 9 chronically lonely individuals for analysis. For purposes of the research question, the nonlonely condition was defined by both two week and lifetime scores being below a score of 30 (out of a possible score of 80) and the total (i.e., $L_1 + L_2$) being less than or equal to 52. These latter criteria were based on the data and were designed to select the individuals with the lowest possible overall loneliness scores. The descriptive data can be seen in Table I. The hypothesis was tested using a one-tail *t*-test due to the directional nature of the predicted difference. Correlational analyses with simple linear assumptions were considered inappropriate due to the theoretical rational predicting different distribution of scores (see Lashbrook, 1980).[3] The research question was assessed by a two-tailed *t*-test since no direction was predicted.

Results

The hypothesis predicting that chronically lonely individuals would exhibit significantly greater CA than situationally lonely individuals was supported ($t(17) = 3.158$, $p < .01$). The mean on the PRCA for the situationally lonely was 60.00, with a standard deviation of 17.20. The PRCA mean for the chronically lonely was 82.11 with a standard deviation of 9.06. Subsequent F-analysis revealed that these standard deviations were not significantly different from each other. Thus, the samples can be considered to have roughly equivalent variances, and do not violate the

homogeneity of variance assumption of t-tests (Ferguson, 1976).[4] The aggregate sample means on L_1 and L_2 were similar to the normative data provided by Ryssell, Peplau and Cutrona (1979) as norms for the scale.

The research question revealed no significant difference between nonlonely and situationally lonely individuals on PRCA scores ($t(19) = .636$, p .01). The PRCA means for both the situationally ($M = 60.00$) and nonlonely ($M = 55.36$) are thus, not meaningfully distinguishable.

DISCUSSION

Current theories of loneliness indicate that attributional processes mediate the individual's experience of loneliness. Yet, little research has attempted to test this assumption. This study investigated the hypothesis that chronically lonely individuals, because of their stable internal attributions of loneliness causation, are more likely to be apprehensive in communicative situations. According to an attributional explanation, loneliness that is experienced and endured over a long period of time is likely to result in negative self-evaluation in perceptions of communicative ability and confidence. In addition, signs of communication apprehension tend to be negatively reinforced through the evaluations of peers. Given these two proclivities, attributional processes can be expected to contibute to anxiety in social communicative settings. The present research is supportive, albeit indirectly, of this interpretation. Essentially, this study indicates that individuals who rate high in duration (i.e., chronic endurance) of loneliness tend to also score high in communication apprehension.

Some limitations to this finding should be noted. First, the operationalization of situational and chronic conditions was less than ideal. Respondents received the exact same items on two scales (20 items each), and several paired observations displayed exact or significant isomorphism in response marking, despite the change in instructions. However, two weeks loneliness correlated .32 with lifetime loneliness, a significant ($p < .01$) but relatively small relationship. The isomorphism of responses could indicate simply that many people experience very similar levels of satisfaction throughout their entire life, including the most recent two weeks. And indeed, predicted differences were still found. But the missed items may still have occurred due to scale-marking fatigue. Such fatigue and redundancy may be diminished by the development of instruments designed specifically for measuring the attributional distinctions of loneliness. Efforts by Young (1979b, 1979c) indicate promise for this approach. Instruments constructed for the purpose of distinguishing chronically and situationally lonely persons should improve efforts to investigate the attributional processes involved in loneliness.

As with much research, it seems that more questions are raised than answered. Several questions were not investigated that need to be. For example, are the conditions of situational and chronic loneliness truly dichotomous, or is there a continuous developmental process of attribution at work? If no, the attributional etiology involved, its patterns and intermediate stages need to be investigated. What kinds of message patterns lead to internalized attributions and which message patterns allow

one to internalize confidence rather than incompetence or anxiety? Another significant area of research would involve Burgoon's (1976) construct of unwillingness to communicate. Unwillingness to communicate is oriented to interpersonal communication, instead of the three areas of small group, public, and interpersonal included in the PRCA.[5] The PRCA taps more into anxiety (Pearson, 1979) while Burgoon's (1976) scale taps more into anomic patterns. Loneliness is an interpersonal deficity. Therefore, it is vital that the interpersonal realm be explored.

CONCLUSION

The results of the present study provide several implications for theory, therapy, and pedagogy. Theoretically, two incompatible findings are presented in the literature to which this study directly relates. McCroskey, et al. (1975) report that apprehensives are negatively perceived by others. Jones, et al. (1978) found that lonely individuals are not differentially perceived or negatively evaluated by others in interaction. The incompatibility of these findings is highlighted by the results of the research reported here, that chronic loneliness is often accompanied by communication apprehension. If chronic loneliness leads to apprehension, then it should also result in the negative interpersonal evaluations that attend CA. This contradiction can be resolved by considering the purposes of the studies and their respective operationalizations.

The study by McCroskey, et al. (1975) did not investigate loneliness or its attributional dimensions. Likewise, the Jones, et al. (1978) research did not specifically intend to

examine anxiety. These studies neither intended nor attempted to tap the same conceptual domain examined in the present study. It is not surprising, therefore, that studies from different conceptual domains result in conflicting findings.

A more useful interpretation of this contradiction concerns the difference between laboratory experimentation and interaction in the proverbial "real world." The McCroskey, et al. (1975) study did not involve any face-to-face interaction. The operationalization of CA consisted of a written description of a target person. The Jones, et al. (1978) research studied actual interaction, but in a laboratory context with structured tasks and without any levels of relational involvement beyond that of strangers. Certainly, the study reported here did not examine actual interaction. Instead, a common denominator of perceived stability of loneliness was investigated. It is this "common denominator" of attributional stability that can be adduced to resolve the conflicting findings.

Both loneliness and CA are typically attended by social isolation and dissatisfying levels of relational intimacy. McCroskey and Sheahan found that communication apprehensives report less dating than they desire compared to nonapprehensives (McCroskey, 1977). This may result from avoidance of interactive opportunities (i.e., external cause). But it may also be due to ineffective management of relationships once initiated. In other words, the recognition of a person's anxiety, and any negative self-evaluations involved in this apprehension, may require interaction over a period of time. A short description or a 15-minute laboratory conversation may not offer enough

"identity information" for an accurate or reliable assessment of an individual's actual attractiveness, apprehensiveness, or skills. This may also explain why Parks, Dindia, Adams, Berlin and Larson (1980) did not replicate McCroskey and Sheahan's (McCroskey 1977) finding regarding actual versus desired dates. Since attributional experiences appear to mediate one's CA, merely discovering the level of CA does not provide reliable information about motivations or perceived ability. It may be that communication apprehensives have difficulty achieving a desired level of dating depending upon the duration of their experience of CA or some other attendent experience. Once they have experienced CA for an extended period of time, their attributions become internalized and the individuals become convinced that their condition is beyond their own control.

The therapeutic implication of this reasoning is that chronically lonely and possibly apprehensive individuals, need more than just exposure to interactive and relational opportunities. These individuals are likely to need training in conversational and relational management skills as well. Their problems may well be in maintaining relationships, instead of, or in addition to, initiating relationships (Barlow, et al., 1977). Also, the indications of the present research are that attributional processes mediate and contribute to the development of some cases of communication apprehension. If relationship management skills are to be used effectively, then the possible interference of CA should be controlled or accounted for. For the apprehensive with strong negative self-evaluations, the behavioral model of treatment may be treating only the symptom

instead of the cause. Reduced anxiety would need to be consistently reinforced positively, before the attributions could be expected to change for the better. The more promising approach is with cognitive restructuring, which is designed to redirect negative self-attributions (Fromouw & Scott, 1979; Peer, 1979; Svanum & Beaman, 1974). Obviously, these theoretic and therapeutic considerations are speculative and open to empirical verification.

The results of this study point to another therapeutic implication. Communication apprehension and loneliness may be involved in a reciprocal relationship. The present research indicates that the extended experience of loneliness is likely to be concomitant with communicative anxiety. This indicates that enduring loneliness is partially a self-perpetuating psychological and communicative cycle. The increased communication apprehension experienced by chronically lonely persons is likely to prevent opportunities to enhance relational satisfaction. CA is marked by avoidance and decreased frequency of communicative interaction. Lonely individuals who avoid interaction obviously only exacerbate their isolation. Also, CA that manifests itself during interactions may prevent escalation of desirable relationships. The possibility that CA entrenches the experiences of loneliness is yet another empirical question that needs to be explored.

Therapeutically then, it seems that different programs of treatment may be justified for chronically lonely individuals. For the chronically lonely, interpersonal perception and skills training may be integral to any intervention strategy. Research

has consistently shown that persons manifesting social anxiety tend to have overly negative evaluations of themselves, regardless of actual skill levels (Clark & Arkowitz, 1975; Glasgow & Arkowitz, 1975). Thus, the priority could be placed on interpersonal perception skills (e.g., empathy and role-taking abilities; see Archer & Kagan, 1973; Berlin & Dies, 1974; Landeros, Hewitt & Heilman, 1979; Briedis, 1978; D'Augelli, 1973; Orlofsky, 1976; Pittman, 1977; Weiss, Lewinsohn & Munoz, 1979). For situationally lonely people, priority possibly needs to be on defining the loneliness in situational terms. More specific therapeutic implications may be discovered once the distinction between chronic and situational loneliness is explored more completely.

Pedagogically, it can be seen from this study that communication apprehension may be symptomatic of significant interpersonal problems. Treating the symptom through traditional formats of reticence therapy (Phillips, 1977; Phillips & Metzger, 1973) and interpersonal communication courses (Tortoriello & Phelps, 1975) may or may not reduce speech anxiety and interpersonal confidence. Yet, the interpersonal problems will likely remain. Communication instructors are in a unique position to recognize apprehensive students. Through proper involvement with such students, university counselling programs could be recommended. In this manner, we may be able to help lives and speeches simultaneously.

[1]The LS appears to have strong construct and content validity claims (Russell, Peplau & Cutrona, 1980). One study by Solano (1979) correlated a conceptually divergent loneliness scale with the UCLA scale. This study found that the UCLA score correlated most highly with two factors labeled pathological loneliness and estrangement. An inspection of these two "factors indicates that they are measuring a lack of social interaction and communication. Thus, the UCLA scale appears to identify a subjective lack of social companionship" (pp. 10-11).

[2]The PRCA has also been correlated with other instruments indicating its construct validity. As a result of one multiple scale correlation, Daly (1978) concluded that "the PRCA may be the most encompassing instrument of those assessed" (p. 216).

[3]As a check on the linearity of the relationships, Pearson r's were run on the variables. Two weeks experience of loneliness was correlated only .24 (p .01) with CA, and lifetime loneliness correlated .22 (p .01) with CA. Although both relations are statistically significant, they are both small, accounting for approximately 5% of common variance each. Examination of the scattergrams verify the nonlinearity and divergent spreads of the scores. Thus, the student's t clearly appears to be the appropriate test.

[4]Supplemental analysis was performed due to the small cell sizes and the discrepant standard deviations. By relaxing the criteria, similarity in standard deviations and isomorphic cells were obtained without affecting the rigor of the conceptualization significantly. The criteria were changed to:

Situational if the score of L_1 49 and the score on L_2 38; and chronic if the score on L_1 49 and the score on L_2 46. This resulted in 12 respondents per cell. The situational condition had a $\underline{M}$ = 59.42 and a $\underline{SD}$ = 15.62. The chronic condition had a $\underline{M}$ = 77.58 and a $\underline{SD}$ = 15.02. These results were still significantly different in the predicted direction ($\underline{t}(22) = 2.797$, $\underline{p}$ .01). Finally, as suggested by Gerguson (1976) for populations with divergent variances, a Cochran and Cox $\underline{t}$-test was run on the original sample with the same results ($\underline{t}(17) = 3.209$, $\underline{p}$ .005).

[5]A new form of the PRCA has been developed that taps four factors: meeting, interpersonal, group and public. This scale may provide a more useful measure than the original PRCA for assessing interpersonal anxiety (personal communication with James C. McCroskey, West Virginia University, 1980).

Table I - Descriptive Data for the Various Samples

	MEAN	SD	PRCA (MEAN)	(SD)
Aggregate (N = 157)	L_1 = 37.88 L_2 = 36.92	L_1 = 11.19 L_2 = 9.46	65.53	15.34
Situational (N = 10)	.....	.....	60.00	17.20
Chronic (N = 9)	.....	.....	82.11	9.06
Nonlonely (N = 11)	.....	.....	55.36	16.19

REFERENCES

Archer, Jr., Jr. & Kagan, N. Teaching interpersonal relationship skills on campus: A pyramid approach. J. of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 30(6), 535-540.

Argyle, M. & Little, B. R. Do personality traits apply to social behavior? J. for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 1972, 2, 1-33.

Arkowitz, H. Measurement and modification of minimal dating behavior. In M. Herson, R. M. Eisler & P. M. Miller (Eds.) Progress in behavior modification, New York: Academic, 1977.

Beatty, M. J., Behnke, R. R. & McCallum, K. Situational determinants of communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1978, 45(3), 187-191.

Beck, A. T. & Young, J. E. College Blues. Psychology Today, 1978, 12(4), 80-97.

Bellack, A. S. & Hersen, M. Chronic psychiatric patients: Social skills training. In M. Hersen & A. S. Bollack (Eds.), Behavior therapy in the psychiatric setting, Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1978.

Berger, C. R. & Calabrese, R. J. Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1( ), 99-112.

Berlin, J. S. & Dies, R. R. Differential group structure: The effects on socially isolated students. Small Group Behavior, 1974, 5(4), 462-472.

Bohart, A. C., Landeros, D.D., Hewitt, B. N. & Heilman, A. Two methods of interpersonal skills training: Conceptual-versus response-oriented approaches. Small Group Behavior, 1979, 10(2), 299-312.

Bradley, R. Measuring loneliness. DAI, Jan. 1970, 30, 338B.

Bragg, M. A comparison of nondepressed and depressed loneliness. Paper presented at the UCLA conference on Loneliness. May, 1979.

Briedis, I. The facilitation of social competence through the implementation of an interpersonal coping skills program. DAI, 1978, 39(3), 143A.

Burgoon, J. K. The unwillingness-to-communicate scales: Development and validation. Communication Monographs, 1976, 43(1), 60-69.

Cattell, R. B. & Scheier, I. H. The nature of anxiety: A review of thirteen multivariate analyses comprising 814 variables. Psychological Reports, 1958, 4(2), 351-388.

Clark, R. A. & Arkowitz, H. Social anxiety and self-evaluation of interpersonal performance. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36(1), 211-221.

Daly, J. A. Communication apprehension and behavior: Applying a multiple act criteria. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(2), 208-216. (a)

_____. The assessment of social-communicative anxiety via self-reports: A comparison of measures. Communication Monographs, 1978, 45(3), 204-218. (b)

Daly, S. Behavioural correlates of social anxiety. British J. of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 17(2), 117-120.

D'Augelli, A. R. Group composition using interpersonal skills: An analogue study on the effects of members' interpersonal skills on peer ratings and group cohesiveness. J. of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 30(6), 531-534.

Endler, N. S., Hunt, J. M., & Rosenstein, A. J. An S-R inventory of anxiousness. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76(17), #536.

Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education, McGraw-Hill, 1959, (4th ed. 1976).

Fischer, C. S. & Phillips, S. L. Who is alone? Social characteristics of people with small networks. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979.

Freeman, M. J. The development of a test for the measurement of anxiety: A study of its reliability and validity. Psychological Monographs, 1953, 67(3), #353.

Freimuth, V. S. The effects of communication apprehension on communication effectiveness. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2(3), 290-298.

Fremouw, W. J. & Scott, M. D. Cognitive restructuring: An alternative method for the treatment of communication apprehension. Communication Education, 1979, 28(2), 129-133.

Fromm-Reichmann, F. Loneliness. Psychiatry, 1959, 22(1), 1-15.

Gerson, A. C. & Perlman, D. Loneliness and expressive communication. J. of Abnormal Psychology, 1979, 88(3), 258-261.

Girodo, M. Shy? New York: Pocket Books, 1978.

Glasgow, R. E. & Arkowitz, H. The behavioral assessment of male and female social competence in dyadic heterosexual interaction. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6(4), 488-498.

Hartog, J. Loneliness and drug abuse: Some speculations. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979.

Horowitz, L. M. & French, R. dS. Interpersonal problems of people who describe themselves as lonely. J of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47(4), 762-764.

Jones, W. H. The persistence of loneliness. Paper presented to the 86th American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, August, 1978.

_____, Freeman, J. E. & Goswick, R. A. The persistence of loneliness: Self and other rejection? Unpublished paper obtained by request of senior author, University of Tulsa, OK, 1978.

Jordon, W. J. & Powers, W. G. Verbal behavior as a function of apprehension and social context. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(4), 294-300.

Kelley, H. H. & Michela, J. L. Attribution theory and research. In Rosenzweig, M. R. & Porter, L. W. (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology, 1980, 31, 457-501.

Knapp, M. L. Social Intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

Kupke, T. E., Calhoun, K. S. & Hobbs, S. A. Selection of heterosocial skills-II. Experimental validity. Behavior Therapy, 1979, 10(3), 336-346.

_____, Hobbs, S. A. & Cheney, T. H. Selection of heterosocial skills-I. Criterion-related validity. Behavior Therapy, 1979, 10(3), 327-335.

Lashbrook, V. J. A critique of BSIG competitive papers II: Replications and extensions. Critique presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Portland, OR, February 1980.

Lazzerini, A. J., Cox, T. & Mackay, C. J. Perceptions of and reactions to stressful situations: The utility of a general anxiety trait. British J. of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 18(4), 363-369.

Lederer, W. J. & Jackson, D. D. The mirages of marriage, New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.

Lewinsohn, P. J., Weiss, A. M. & Munoz, R. F. Nonspecific improvement effects in depression using interpersonal skills training, pleasant activity schedules or cognitive training. J. of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47(3), 427-439.

Loucks, S. The dimensions of loneliness: A psychological study of affect, self-concept, and object-relations. DAI, 1974, 35(6), 3024B.

Lynch, J. J. The broken heart: The medical consequences of loneliness, New York: Basic Books, 1977.

McCroskey, J. C. Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 1970, 37(4), 269-277.

_____. Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 1977, 4(1), 78-96.

_____. Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1978, 45(3), 192-203.

_____, Daly, J. A., Richmond, V. P. & Falcione, R. L. Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3(3), 269-277.

_____, Richmond, V. P., Daly, J. A. & Cox, B. C. The effects of communication apprehension on interpersonal attraction. Human Communication Research, 1975, 2(1), 51-65.

McReynolds, P. The assessment of anxiety: A survey of available techniques. In P. McReynolds (Ed.), Advances in psychological assessment, Vol. I, Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1968.

Millar, F. E. & Rogers, L. E. A relational approach to interpersonal communication. In G. R. Miller (Ed.), Explorations in interpersonal communication, Vol. V, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976.

Miller, G. R. & Steinberg, M. Between people: A new analysis of interpersonal communication, Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975.

Moore, J. A. Loneliness: Self-discrepancy and sociological variables, Canadian Counsellor, 1976, 10(3), 133-135.

_____. Relationship between loneliness and interpersonal relationships. Canadian Counsellor, 1974, 8(2), 84-89.

_____ & Sermat, V. Relationship between self-actualization and self-reported loneliness. Canadian Counsellor, 1974, 8(3), 194-196.

Moustakas, C. E. Loneliness and love, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Nerviano, V. J. & Gross, W. F. Loneliness and locus of control for alcoholic males: Validity against Murray need and Cattell trait dimensions. J. of Clinical Psychology, 1976, 32( ), 479-48

Oriofsky, J. L. Intimacy status: Relationship to interpersonal perception. J. of Youth and Adolescence, 1976, 5(1), 73-88.

Paloutzian, R. F. & Ellison, C. W. Emotional, behavioral and physical correlates of loneliness. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979.

Parks, M. R. Anomia and close friendship communication networks. Human Communication Research, 1977, 4(1), 48-57.

Parks, M. R., Dindia, K., Adams, J., Berlin, E. & Larson, K. Communication apprehension and student dating patterns: An attempted replication and extension. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Convention, Portland, OR., February, 1980

Pearson, J. C. A factor analytic study of the items in the Rathus assertiveness schedule and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension. Psychological Reports, 1979, 45(2), 491-497.

Peer, K. C. The effects of invalidation of individual constructs on self-reported anxiety and psychological arousal: A test of G. A. Kelly's anxiety hypothesis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1979.

Peplau, L. A. & Perlman, D. Blueprint for a social psychological theory of loneliness. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979.

_____, Russell, D. & Heim, M. The experience of loneliness. In I. H. Frieze, D. Bar-Tal and J. S. Carroll (Eds.), New approaches to social problems: Application of attribution theory, San Francisco: Jessey-Bass, 1979.

Perlman, D. & Peplau, L. A. Toward a social psychology of loneliness. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May, 1979.

Phillips, C. M. Reticence: Pathology of the normal speaker. Speech Monographs, 1968, 35(1), 39-49.

_____. Rhetoritherapy versus the medical model: Dealing with reticence. Communication Education. 1977, 26(1), 34-43.

_____ & Metzger, N. J. The reticent syndrome: Some theoretical considerations about etiology and treatment. Speech Monographs, 1973, 40(3), 220-230.

Pilkonis, P.A. Shyness, public and private, and its relationship to other measures of social behavior. J. of Personality, 1977, 45(4), 585-595. (a)

_____. The behavioral consequences of shyness. J. of Personality, 1977, 45(4), 596-611. (b)

Pilkonis, P.A. & Zimbardo, P. G. The personal and social dynamics of shyness. In C. E. Izard (Ed.), Emotions in personality and psychopathology, New York: Plenum, 1979.

Pittman, W. M. The relative effectiveness of three group counseling approaches in reducing loneliness among college students. DAI, February 1977, 37, 4870A.

Porter, D. T. Communication apprehension: Communication's latest artifact? In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 3, New Brunswick: ICA/Transaction Books, 1979, 241-259.

Powers, W. C. & Hutchinson, K. The measurement of communication apprehension in the marriage relationship. J. of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41(1), 89-95.

Rierman, D., Glazer, N. & Donney, R. The lonely crowd, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1950.

Rosenfeld, L. H. & Plax, T. G. Personality determinants of reticence. Western J. of Speech Communication, 1976, 40(1), 22-31.

Rubenstein, C., Shaver, P. & Peplau, L.A. Loneliness. Human Nature, 1979, 2(2), 58-65.

Rubin, Z. Seeking a cure for loneliness. Psychology Today, 1979, 13(4), 82-90.

Russell, D., Peplau, L. A. & Cutrona, C. Conceptual and methodological issues in studying loneliness. Paper distributed at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May, 1979.

_____, Peplau, L. A. & Cutrona, C. E. The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. J. of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(3), 472-480.

_____, Peplau, L. A. & Ferguson, M. L. Developing a measure of loneliness. J. of Personality Assessment, 1978, 42( ), 290-294.

Sadler, W. A. The causes of loneliness. Science Digest, July 1975, 78(1), 58-66.

Sermat, V. Satisfaction of different types of interpersonal relationships, willingness to take social risks, and loneliness. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979.

Shaver, P. & Rubenstein, C. M. The effects of parental attachment and loss during childhood on subsequent adult loneliness, self-esteem, and health. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979.

Shoben, E. J., Jr. Love, loneliness and logic. J. of Individual Psychology, 1960, 16(1), 11-24.

Slater, P. The pursuit of loneliness. Boston: Beacon, 1976.

Smith, M. B. toward a conception of the compent self. In J. A. Clausen (Ed.), Socialization and society, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1968.

Solano, C. J. Two measures of loneliness: A comparison. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979.

Spengler, J. C. A phenomenological explication of loneliness. DAI, July 1976, 36, 7735A.

Spielberger, C. D. Anxiety and behavior, New York: Academic, 1966.

The author. Interpersonal competence and loneliness. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Portland, OR, February 1980.

Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry, H. S. Perry & M. L. Gawel (Eds.), New York: Norton, 1953.

Svanum, S. & Beaman, A. L. Manipulation of train anxiety through cognitive relabling. Proceedings of the division of personality and social psychology, 1974, Washington, D.C.: Division of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974.

Tortoriello, T. R. & Phelps, L. S. Can students apply interpersonal theory? Today's Speech, 1975, 23(3), 45-49.

U. P. I. "Lonely" man says he'll kill. Daily Breeze, Torrance, CA, January 2, 1980.

Valle, V. A. The effect of the stability of attributions on future expectations. Proceedings of the division of personality and social psychology, 1974, Washington, D.C.: Division of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974.

Weiss, R. S. Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation, Cambridge: MIT, 1970.

Wood, L. A. Social-psychological correlates of loneliness. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May, 1979.

Young, J. A cognitive-behavioral approach to the treatment of loneliness. Paper presented at the UCLA Conference on Loneliness, May 1979. (a)

_____. An instrument for measuring loneliness. Paper presented at the A. P. A. Convention, New York, September 4, 1979. (b)

_____. Cognitive therapy and loneliness. Paper presented at the A. P. A. Convention, New York, September 2, 1979. (c)